



28,654/B/2

L. LXVI.

19 Lh





OBSERVATIONS  
ON  
A LATE PUBLICATION OF DR. PEARSON,  
ENTITLED,  
AN EXAMINATION  
OF THE  
REPORT  
OF THE  
*COMMITTEE of the HOUSE of COMMONS,*  
ON THE CLAIMS OF REMUNERATION  
FOR THE  
VACCINE POCK INOCULATION,  
WITH AN  
APPENDIX  
CONTAINING  
SOME REFLECTIONS ON AN ARTICLE  
IN THE  
*CRITICAL REVIEW*  
FOR OCTOBER LAST,  
RESPECTING THE SAME PUBLICATION.

---

BY  
HENRY HICKS.

---

Envy's a Shade that ever waits on Fame. CHAUCER.

---

STROUD:  
PRINTED BY W. S. WILSON;  
AND SOLD BY  
T. HURST, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

---

M.DCCC.III.

91895

81205167/140000

ZOBRY 25.00 TO YOUNG 25.00 STATE 25.

КОМПАНИЯ ВА

СНТ 25.

TROTH



---

## PREFACE.

I FEEL a considerable degree of reluctance in addressing the Public upon a subject which has so much occupied its attention ; and I certainly should not have undertaken such a task, if the reputation of a man with whom, I am proud and happy to say, I have ever lived in the closest and most uninterrupted friendship, had not been attacked in the most shameless and unjustifiable manner by Dr. Pearson, in a late publication, entitled, "An Examination of the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons, on the Claims of Remuneration for the Vaccine Pock Inoculation,"

As I wish to be as concise as possible, I shall not enter into any preliminary observations—I shall not follow the example of Dr. Pearson in his unmeaning parade of candor, but I shall endeavor, without professing any very profound respect either for his love of truth or justice, fairly to

meet him in the field of controversy, in the full confidence that I shall be able to expose the fallacy of most of his statements.

BEFORE I took up my pen, I wrote to my friend Dr. Jenner, to ask him, whether he intended to make any reply to Dr. Pearson's invidious attack upon his reputation ; his answer was (as I expected it would be) that as he had never yet thought it worth his while to notice any of his former remarks, he should now pursue the same line of conduct, and treat his present publication with silent contempt.

UNDER the impression of this determination, with feelings of the most affectionate regard for Dr. Jenner, I cannot think it necessary to make any further apology for having thus come forwards in his defence.

WHETHER the House of Commons will be indifferent to Dr. Pearson's reflections upon the integrity of the Committee appointed to take the petition into consideration, must be left for time to discover. I have, myself, no hesitation in calling his book a direct libel on its proceedings.

---

## OBSERVATIONS, &c.

---



BEFORE I began to make those observations on the publication of Dr. Pearson, which will be found in the following pages, I thought it proper to read a former work of his relating to the same subject, and entitled, "An Enquiry concerning the History of Cow-Pox."

UPON this I must first be allowed to introduce a few remarks; leaving it to the Public to compare the violent attempts he has lately made to injure the reputation of Dr. Jenner, with that soft and flattering language, which he was at that time induced to adopt.

IN page 3, of this work, Dr. Pearson says, "Perhaps it may be right to declare, that I entertain not the most distant expectation of participating the smallest share of honor on the score of facts; the honor, on this account, by the justest title exclusively belongs to Dr. Jenner: and I would not pluck a sprig of laurel from the wreath that decorates his brow." Let this be remembered, for I am much mistaken if it will not be found, in the progress of these observations, that Dr. Pearson has attempted to pluck more than a sprig; and if he has not been able forcibly to tear away the whole wreath, he has made a strong effort to wither it up with the breath of envy and detraction.

IN page 4, of his first publication, Dr. Pearson gives Dr. Jenner the greatest merit "for the industry of his researches, in ascertaining the invaluable fact of Cow-pox being an effectual preventive of Small-pox;" and he tells us, that the late Mr. John Hunter communicated to him the information he had received from Dr. Jenner, upon this subject, about nine years ago. Dr.

Pearson, himself, in his lectures always mentioned the circumstance as reflecting credit upon Dr. Jenner, and as a striking proof of his ingenuity; but when this declaration was made, the spirit of enmity had not taken possession of his mind.

PAGE 6, Dr. Pearson says, "that on conversing " with Sir George Baker, Bart. concerning the " Cow-pox rendering people unsusceptible of the " variolous disease, Sir George observed, he had " been informed of the same fact, in some papers " on the Cow-pox, communicated to him many " years ago; but, as the statement did not then " obtain credit, it was not published. After a " fruitless search for these papers, Sir George, " whose zeal for the improvement of physic did " not forsake him on this occasion, authorized me " to write to his relative, the Rev. Herman Drewe, " of Abbots."

Dr. P. next gives us Mr. Drewe's letter, dated July 5, 1798, by which we are informed that a Mr. Bragge, who inoculated his parish for the Small-pox, charged with a superabundance of matter

three women that had had the Cow-pox, who completely resisted the infection; and who were not in the least disordered, though they constantly associated with other patients who had been inoculated for the Small-pox with effect. He also adds, that there were thirteen similar instances in the same neighbourhood. Mr. Drewe then tells Dr. Pearson from whom he received all his information, and concludes by saying, "that he had "not thought of the matter since, and that as his "letter on the subject had escaped Sir George "Baker's search, so had many particulars escaped "his recollection." Was ever any thing more vague or unsatisfactory than all this? Can it be supposed that Sir George Baker, a man of such active scientific enquiry, would have destroyed or mislaid papers \*, which tended to throw so much new light on so important a branch of physiology?

I wish my readers to compare this statement with that which Dr. Pearson adduced before the

\* I have heard that Sir George Baker declared he burnt the papers designedly.—A pretty convincing proof of what value they were in his estimation.

Committee, and which he has detailed from page 17 to 29.

MANY of the members were struck with the manner in which he produced this correspondence, and more particularly so when they found that Mr. Nash's manuscripts, on which he principally rested to establish a knowledge of Vaccine inoculation previous to Dr. Jenner's, did not bear any date, although his son, Mr. Thomas Nash, in his examination, said they were written between the years 1781 and 1785.—Here Dr. Pearson, with a sort of triumph, stops short, though common justice demanded of him to state the evidence of Mr. Gardner, which positively proved that Dr. Jenner had communicated to him his ideas of Vaccine inoculation in the month of May, 1780, (see Report, p. 25.) ; and, in addition to this evidence, which wholly supercedes by priority of date the loose and suspicious testimonies adduced by Dr. Pearson, I must inform him, that Dr. Jenner made the subject a matter of common conversation among his friends long before this period. I would also ask Dr. Pearson, why this correspon-

dence, which is so slightly mentioned in his first publication, swells into so much consequence upon the presentation of Dr. Jenner's petition, and why he so anxiously labours to convert it into the means of depriving him of the merit of being the discoverer of Vaccine inoculation? If truth is to dictate the reply, this question may soon be answered.—We can only refer it to that spirit of hostility against Dr. Jenner's reputation, which so strongly marks all his proceedings; to his envy of the reward which Parliament has so justly bestowed upon him; and, to that *modesty* which has excited him to assert, that he and Dr. Woodville had a better grounded title to remuneration than Dr. Jenner!!!

As Dr. Pearson endeavours to attach great consequence to the manuscripts of Mr. Nash, on account of the accuracy of his Cow-pox experiments, with which he wished to impress the minds of the Committee, to shew how far they are entitled to such credit, it will only be necessary to notice one particular circumstance, which will at once place the value of his communications in

rather a different point of view to that in which Dr. Pearson has exhibited them,

MR. Nash, when speaking of the casual Cow-pox, says, "that he has known *some* of the inhabitants of a house where it was, escape it, but *none of those who lay in the same bed with the diseased person.*"

Now, if Mr. Nash found that persons in an infected state communicated the complaint to others by sleeping with them, I can only say, it is altogether different to what has ever been experienced among the dairy farms in Gloucestershire. Dr. Jenner has clearly and decidedly proved, that infection has never taken place in this manner. When we are able to invalidate the representation of so important a fact as this, I must be allowed to repeat, that it weakens the whole evidence of these boasted manuscripts, which I always considered as suspicious sort of testimonies \*.

\* Does the evidence of Mr. Nash establish the fact of a single instance of Vaccine inoculation, as performed by him?—On what ground then, I must beg leave to ask Dr. Pearson, can Mr. Nash be represented as an *experienced Vaccine inoculator?*

Let us now compare what Dr. Pearson has said concerning the inoculation of infants, in his last publication, page 86, with what he states in his first, page 38. In the last he informs us, "that the " Public was principally indebted to him and to Dr. " Woodville, for the discovery of the important fact " of the safety of infant inoculation." How does this agree with what appears in his first treatise? In page 38 of which he says, that " one of Dr. " Jenner's patients, inoculated with Cow-pox, " was only six months old, who took the infec- " tion; and the confidence of Dr. Jenner, in the " *safety and efficacy* of the inoculation of Cow- " pox, is unequivocally declared by the inocula- " tion of his own son, aged eleven months." Dr. Pearson, in his evidence before the Committee declared, that it was not within his recollection that Dr. Jenner had inoculated infants. If his memory is of so curious a construction as thus to forget its so recent acknowledgments, it must be very deceitful indeed! We next remark a quotation from Mr. Drewe's letter, which stands in direct opposition to what Dr. Pearson endeavours to support, from a correspondence upon which I

have before made some observations. Mr. Drewe says, "Mr. Bragge and I endeavoured to try the experiment of inoculation with the matter of Cow-pox, but from the scarceness of the disease, and the unwillingness of patients, we were disappointed." Where then are all the boasted experiments of these gentlemen? What I have already said is sufficient to shew the real character of Dr. Pearson; and I trust I shall be able to prove, in my subsequent remarks, notwithstanding the panegyric which Dr. Pearson has lavished upon himself, that he has by no means improved the practice; that he has not established a single new fact; and, that he has totally failed in his invidious efforts to blast the well-earned fame of Dr. Jenner.

I SHALL now proceed with my observations upon Dr. Pearson's examination of the Report of the Committee.

THE very first page presents something so insidious, that it ought not to pass unnoticed: Dr. Pearson says, "that he can with truth declare, Dr. Jenner to be the *first discoverer to the Public*

" of Vaccine inoculation, agreeably to the acknowledgment contained in his first publication." He, then, thinks it necessary to explain what he means by *discoverer to the Public*, in which he betrays a most determined opposition to Dr. Jenner's claim to originality, as well as to the grounds upon which the Committee thought he had founded his title to public remuneration. The first emotion which is excited in an ingenuous mind, by this hypocritical explanation, must be a strong feeling of contempt, but this will be immediately succeeded by the stronger impulses of indignation.

THOUGH Dr. Pearson labours and toils throughout his whole book to detract from the propriety of all Dr. Jenner's claims, any unprejudiced person will at once perceive, how totally he has failed in his design, and how much he has exposed his own want of *candor* and *justice*.

I CANNOT help frequently recurring to a comparison of some of Dr. Pearson's own statements; and, perhaps, this is the shortest way of exposing their fallacy. In page 2, of his late work, he tells

us, "that no fact has informed him that human society would have been at this hour in the possession of the blessings of Vaccine inoculation, had it not been for Dr. Jenner's publication of the treatise on the causes and effects of the Variolæ Vaccinæ, in June, 1798 \*." Does this at all agree with Dr. Pearson's remarks on the correspondence of Mr. Drewe, &c. &c.? Were not these correspondencies brought forwards with the view of detracting from Dr. Jenner's merits? There is something so invidious (I had almost said malevolent) in the whole of this transaction, that I know not how to employ language sufficiently strong to express my reprobation of it. If all these facts had existed, as related in these letters and in Mr. Nash's evidence, how are they to be reconciled to Dr. Pearson's declaration which I have just before recited?

AGAIN; Mr. Nash declares in his evidence, he "had heard *from rumor* that Dr. Jenner might

\* DOES not this confession comprise every thing that can be advanced upon the subject? and, after such a confession, are not all Dr. Pearson's arguments against Dr. Jenner's claim to originality perfectly nugatory? It seems almost to supersede the necessity of going further into the question.

"have been known to his father;" thereby insinuating, that he probably derived his first knowledge from that source; but I have the authority of Dr. Jenner himself to declare, that he never knew or heard of such a person as Mr. Nash, or of any of the circumstances here attempted to be established, until they appeared before the Committee: and when Dr. Pearson descends to bring forwards such loose unfounded *supposition*, it throws a degree of suspicion on all his contravening evidence. For the Doctor's own credit it would have been better had these papers never appeared; and, fortunately for Dr. Jenner, it was incontrovertibly proved to the Committee that he had communicated to Mr. Gardner his general ideas of Cow-pox, (and amongst others, that it might probably be continued in perpetuity, by inoculation, from one human being to another) previous to the time when Mr. Nash attempts to prove from recollection, that certain papers were written by his father.

ANY indifferent person reading what Dr. Pearson says, in pages 32, 33, & 34, would be led to sup-

pose that Dr. Jenner claimed the discovery of the fact, that Cow-pox was a preventive of Small-pox. I need only refer to Dr. Jenner's first publication, which will fully evince that he never meant to advance any such claim;\* on the contrary he tells us, that the knowledge of this fact is of so early a date, that the recollection of the oldest persons with whom he ever conversed could never fix it to any particular period.

IN pages 35 and 36, Dr. Pearson adduces the testimonies of several medical gentlemen respecting the claim of Dr. Jenner to the discovery of Vaccine inoculation, and he has done this to prove that Dr. Woodville and himself had both published treatises on the subject, containing lists of cases, and that in the course of their practice they had discovered some errors in the theory and opinions first published by Dr. Jenner; we are not informed what

\* IN a publication of Dr. Jenner's, on the Origin of Vaccine Inoculation, in the early part of the year 1801, is the following sentence: "On enquiry the Cow-pox had been known among the dairies time immemorial, and a vague opinion prevailed that it was preventive of the Small-pox." This paper was copied into the Medical and Physical Journal, so that the acknowledgment did not want publicity.

these errors were, but he was asked in the committee-room whether Dr. Jenner had retracted these opinions, and he was reluctantly obliged to confess, he had not.

NOTWITHSTANDING the parade which Dr. Pearson makes of his own merits, I do not believe that there is any well informed medical gentleman who is not ready to acknowledge, that Dr. Jenner's publications contain all the valuable facts which the world is in possession of upon this momentous subject;\* and the modesty with which Dr. Jenner first published his opinions, would be no improper model for Dr. Pearson's future observations.

IN page 38, Dr. Pearson says, he has given proofs that other persons had inoculated for the Cow-pox long before Dr. Jenner; and he arrogates to himself no small share of credit for his candor in acknowledging to the Committee, that these in-

\* THIS fact is corroborated by a paper written by that great and worthy man Dr. Denman, inserted in the Medical and Physical Journal. Besides these, there are abundant testimonies of foreign authors, who inoculated with the most complete success, without any other guide than Dr. Jenner's first work on the Variolæ Vaccinæ.

oculations, and those of Dr. Jenner, were independent of each other. I have before made some remarks upon these *proofs*, as Dr. Pearson pleases to call them. They certainly amount to assertions, that some casual, unsystematical instances of inoculation had taken place ; and admitting this to be so, were such experiments instituted with any view to the benefit of mankind ? Were they ever made public, or did any general good ever result from them ? Certainly not ; nor can they be considered as in the least derogating from Dr. Jenner's claim to public remuneration. I risk the imputation of tautology, but I must again assert, that Dr. Jenner never meant to claim the discovery of the preventive powers of Cow-pox ; these powers existed by the immutable laws of physiology, they existed long before Dr. Jenner conceived the happy idea of converting the fact to public utility by Vaccine inoculation, and long before Dr. Pearson ungenerously attempted to rob him of his well-earned fame.

DR. Pearson has detailed many vague hearsay stories, but not a single fact that lessens Dr. Jen-

ner's claim to originality, or to the gratitude of mankind. That no consequence was attached to those casual instances of inoculation, which Dr. Pearson labours to prove took place previous to Dr. Jenner's experiments, is sufficiently evinced by their never having attracted the notice of medical men; and, more so, by Sir George Baker's having mislaid or destroyed papers which Dr. Pearson would insinuate, contained all the valuable knowledge published by Dr. Jenner.

PAGE 33, Dr. Pearson says, " Had I thought fit  
 " to have reasoned against the pecuniary interests  
 " of the petitioner, a fair opportunity was af-  
 " forded by the knowledge I possessed of many  
 " examples of inoculation for the Cow-pock, pre-  
 " viously to the *seven* cases Dr. Jenner published." Here, I presume, Dr. Pearson would wish us to admire his great candor. But can we reason with patience on such glaring mis-statements? Was it possible to evince a stronger disposition to detract from Dr. Jenner's merits than appeared in Dr. Pearson's evidence, as well as in that which he acknowledged he excited? or were more deter-

mined efforts ever made to impress the minds of the Committee, that the petitioner was not deserving of reward?

It was fortunate for Dr. Jenner that the Gentlemen who formed the Committee were men of accurate discernment, and that they were not to be misled by the idle tales related by Dr. Pearson, from those strong impressive facts which were established by as respectable a body of evidence as ever appeared upon record.

Does the Dr. (according to his general boast) ground his statements on the basis of facts, when he asserts, that Dr. Jenner published only seven or eight cases of inoculation in his first treatise on the Vaccine disease, and that of these only four were from one human subject to another? or is he more correct in his affirmation, that he (Dr. Pearson) was the first who inoculated infants? There certainly never was a more gross and wilful mis-statement, and I need only refer to the work itself to disprove every one of these positions; to shew he

was not the first to inoculate infants, and that instead of seven cases, thus invidiously and erroneously represented as constituting the whole of Dr. Jenner's experience, a much greater number is there recorded.—There are, first, Cases 17, 18, 19, and 20; then case 21 states that *several\** children and adults were inoculated from the arm of W. Pead, one of them an infant six months old; and case 22, relates four more distinct inoculations, two of which were also infants. Further comment is unnecessary. Fortunately for the cause of Truth, temerity of assertion is not always relied upon as fact. The man remarkable for one, can seldom be depended upon for the other; and, really, when we reflect upon such studied misrepresentations to serve the purpose of unmerited detraction, we can hardly desist from closing the book with disgust.

\* By several children, Dr. Jenner certainly meant to convey the idea of a considerable number; but he did not think it necessary to specify their names, the fact he wished to establish being clearly proved by the preceding cases; and that this was so I can speak from my own knowledge, as I was then in constant habits of intercourse with him, and had an opportunity of knowing all his Vaccine experiments.

DR. Jenner, with a laudable attention to preserve the new practice from inconvenience, candidly tells us in what way it may affect the arms of infants; and, having himself experienced some cases where considerable degree of inflammation occurred, he points out several simple remedies for checking its progress. In the early stages of experiment Dr. Jenner was, of course, alive to every circumstance that might affect the discovery; and, I believe it is in general pretty well agreed, that it was better to have erred a little on the side of superabundant caution, than to have rushed forwards, as some adventurous gentlemen might have done, heedless of every consequence.

It very rarely happens, that in any invention there does not remain, after its promulgation, something to be added, and something to be amended; but it was the almost singular good fortune of Dr. Jenner, that his *first* publication was so peculiarly correct, that it afforded the practitioner nearly all the information necessary to guide him, in the trackless path, with perfect safety.

PAGE 43, Dr. Pearson says, "that from the time  
" of Dr. Jenner's first publication in June, 1798,  
" he could only investigate the history of Cow-  
" pox, by inquiries among provincial physicians  
" and farmers, by which he was enabled to con-  
" firm some of the facts in Dr. Jenner's book, to  
" render doubtful, or to disprove others, and  
" to bring to light new observations." Has  
Dr. Pearson forgotten, then, that he solicited ex-  
planations, and obtained a very considerable de-  
gree of information from Dr. Jenner, who was  
strongly cautioned, by many of his friends, from  
holding any communication with him? they knew  
Dr. Pearson's character; they knew that he would  
avail himself of every thing he could obtain from  
him, and that, upon the basis of such information,  
he would endeavour to build up his own fame.

I SHOULD be happy to be informed, what new  
lights Dr. Pearson has thrown upon the subject,  
or what are the errors which he has detected: I  
have never heard or read of either one or the  
other excepting what he has himself spoken of

in general terms, but of which he has not condescended to detail the particulars.

FROM page 44 to 84, we observe a further and more extended eulogium which Dr. Pearson has bestowed upon himself; but, unfortunately for him, it only serves to place in a fresh point of view, his eagerness in seizing upon a popular subject to obtrude himself upon the public, and to magnify his own importance without adding one single iota of knowledge to the discovery. There is, indeed, so much misrepresentation, so much perversion, staining every page of Dr. Pearson's book, that each new glance awakens sentiments of disapprobation, and discovers fresh cause for the severest animadversion.

PAGE 85, Dr. Pearson asserts, that in the early part of the practice, Dr. Jenner expressed some apprehensions, that more inflammation might take place upon the arm from Vaccine inoculation, than from the Small-pox, and that from communications between Dr. Jenner, Dr. Woodville, and himself, some fears were entertained respecting its

effects upon infants. There would be no difficulty in proving that at this period several cases of very considerable inflammation occurred in the experience of many medical men, who applied to Dr. Jenner to point out a remedy \*; the same had also happened in his own practice, and he was naturally anxious to remove the least shadow of objection that might exist against Vaccine inoculation.—From this circumstance Dr. Pearson takes occasion to throw out the most illiberal reflections, and seizes every opportunity of introducing the words *caustic* and *escharotic*.

In extreme cases such remedies were certainly mentioned ; but Dr. Pearson would have displayed a greater regard to truth, and would have exhibited a fairer specimen of his candor, if he had added what Dr. Jenner further said upon the same subject, which was, that in almost all cases diluted extract of Saturn was an efficient remedy. In the two instances where caustics were made use of, it

\* MR. Tierney, surgeon to the South Gloucester Militia, relates, that he experienced some unpleasant cases of sore arms in the Vaccine inoculation, and that he was obliged to arrest the inflammation with mercurial ointment, one of the remedies which Dr. Jenner pointed out.

was with a view to a most important part of what is now involved in the History of Vaccine inoculation ; it ascertained that although the pustule was removed upon the eighth day by these applications, yet the patients were found unsusceptible of the Small-Pox. Dr. Jenner's reasoning at this early period of the investigation was certainly fair, as the use of caustics, in the mild manner he recommended them, could scarcely be said to give pain. When he discovered, very soon after, that more simple applications answered every purpose, he embraced the first opportunity of making them known. This, again, Dr. Pearson, with his usual correctness, takes no notice of.

FROM page 86 to 92, Dr. Pearson labors to prove, that there is no occasion for paying any attention to the time when matter is taken from the pustule for the purpose of inoculation ; although I believe the general result of the experience of most medical men has shewn, that it is much more certain in its effects, if taken as early as the eighth or ninth day ; and, notwithstanding all Dr. Pearson has said, he will find that they who have

engaged in this practice, are anxious to take the matter as early as the abovementioned periods. Dr. Jenner never asserted, that there was any difference respecting the time, provided the genuine Cow-pock pustule is produced ; but he is certainly right when he recommends it to be taken as early as the eighth day, according to the printed directions which he has so long circulated. Dr. Pearson, himself, will scarcely be so hardy as to deny this ; and Dr. Woodville in his letter to Dr. Pearson says, " he "never uses any matter unless it be perfectly fluid." In this Dr. W. ought certainly more fully to have explained what he meant, for if he considers this as the only test, I will venture to assert it may often prove a very deceitful one, as matter may be taken in a fluid state at so late a period as will rarely produce the real Vaccine disease. In this same letter an attempt is made to throw a degree of ridicule and discredit upon the evidence of Dr. B. and Mr. K. because they speak of virus taken at an improper state of maturation, producing a spurious sort of disease, both in Cow-pox and Small-pox. This potent letter, as Dr. Pearson terms it, will, I think, lose some of its persuasive charms, if we

refer to those cases adduced in Dr. Jenner's publication to prove, that a spurious disease may be produced by inoculating with variolous matter taken under particular circumstances. Nothing can be more conclusive upon this point than Mr. Earle's letter, published in Dr. Jenner's second treatise, wherein he states, "that out of five patients inoculated with such matter, and who had an eruptive disease which deceived Mr. Earle himself, four of them took the Small-pox in the natural way, one of whom died, and the other, being cautioned to avoid the chance of infection, escaped the disease through life." If Dr. Pearson wishes for more satisfaction on this point, let him consult Mr. Kite's Essays, or let him listen to the testimony of half the medical world upon the same subject.

I LEAVE Dr. Pearson to reconcile these facts with his own and Dr. Woodville's doctrine. If further evidence be wanting, I can quote a case which occurred about two years since at a farm house at Arlingham, in the county of Gloucester, where a boy had been inoculated with variolous matter,

and had been covered with eruptions; but, about twelve months afterwards, some of the same family having the Small-pox, he caught the disease and had a most severe burthen.

Dr. Pearson would persuade the world, that Dr. Jenner's description of the Vaccine pustule tends rather to mislead than to point out its true character, and that what he has asserted respecting its resemblance to the variolous is incorrect. This is an additional instance of Dr. Pearson's inconsistency, for we have only to refer to his own plate for a full exemplification of such resemblance; and, notwithstanding the censure he has bestowed on Dr. Jenner, he has himself exhibited the Vaccine pock, No. 5, which I beg leave to point out as being very much like the variolous in its early state.

It would be an unnecessary waste of time to attempt a refutation of Dr. Pearson's arguments on this head, as almost every account that has been published in different parts of the kingdom, bears ample testimony of Dr. Jenner having fully es-  
ta-

blished all the facts on which his opinions and observations are founded ; and every well-informed practitioner agrees that the plates of Dr. Jenner, in his first treatise, characterize the Vaccine pustule completely in many different stages. It only excites our surprize and admiration, how he could have given it so correctly at that early period of the enquiry.

DR. Pearson's next charge is of a different nature, and he has managed it with some dexterity : he asserts that Dr. Jenner sent matter to Dr. Odier of Geneva, which produced the spurious Cow-pock.

DR. Jenner, as I have been well informed, did send matter to Dr. Odier, and had the satisfaction of hearing that it completely answered the purpose, and that it was the source from which he commenced a series of experiments. Instead, then, of his having sent spurious Cow-pock matter, as Dr. Pearson plainly asserts, the fact is, that Dr. Odier's first inoculations were from matter transmitted from Vienna; but, this having deceived his

expectations, he wrote to Dr. Jenner, who immediately sent him the virus on which he probably founded all his further effective inoculations.

A SATISFACTORY apology is due to Dr. Jenner for so palpable a misrepresentation; but we can scarcely expect this from Dr. Pearson, who has twisted and distorted almost every fact to his prejudice.

PAGE 104, Dr. Pearson wishes to impress us with an opinion, that he and Dr. Woodville were the first practitioners who properly discriminated the Cow-pock and Small-pox pustules \*. A very modest assurance truly ! Why did Dr. Jenner take so much pains, and put himself to such expence with the plates in his first treatise, if it was not to convey the most correct idea of the characteristic of the Vaccine pustule ? In every respect they are certainly superior to the boasted representations of Dr. Pearson.

\* Both Drs. Woodville and Pearson, in their early correspondence with Dr. Jenner, spoke of the resemblance of the Vaccine pustule to the variolous!!! What medium they have lately seen through I believe I need not explain.

PAGE 104 and 105, Dr. Pearson insists upon it,  
" that to the acuteness of Dr. Woodville, the pub-  
" lic are indebted for its knowledge of the cha-  
" racteristic properties of the inoculated Vaccine  
" pock, and that the obligations to him can only  
" be appreciated by considering that he was led to  
" expect from Dr. Jenner's account a quite dif-  
" ferently appearing pock from that which the  
" world knows to be the fact." This is boldly  
spoken; but can it be supposed for a moment that  
Dr. Jenner, who for many years had so attentively  
studied the nature of, and so closely watched  
the progress of the disease, should have been ig-  
norant of that which was so essential to convey a  
just idea of it. I must here take leave to inform  
Dr. Pearson, that long before himself or Dr.  
Woodville published any book upon the subject,  
or, perhaps, before either of them knew of such a  
disease as Cow-pox, even by name, Dr. Jenner had  
explained to me, and to several of his friends,  
all the different appearances of the Vaccine puf-  
tule, and there are also many medical men to  
whom Dr. Jenner fully described the particulars of  
its rise, progress, and termination. I presume,

then, that no person can doubt Dr. Jenner's ability to give as accurate an account of it, as either Dr. Pearson or Dr. Woodville, even after all the information they have obtained from Dr. Jenner himself, upon which they certainly founded their own observations.

But Dr. Pearson again repeats, and still persists in the assertion, that "until Dr. Woodville described the Vaccine pustule the world was not accurately acquainted with it;" and he adds, "he wonders so important a matter should have escaped Dr. Jenner's notice, who was so much interested in the propagation of the true Vaccina." In the same page he also attempts to prove that Dr. Jenner's representation of the Cow-pox pustule, in his plates, was *almost useless*, and makes Dr. Jenner, himself, say, that it exactly resembled the Small-pox. How absurd is this assertion ! Are the Cow-pox pustules, as drawn by Dr. Jenner, exactly like those of the Small-pox ? If they are not, it sufficiently exposes Dr. Pearson's false and illiberal strictures upon this part of the subject.

DR Pearson next attempts to cast a degree of ridicule upon what is denominated *spurious* Cow-pox; but this is a mere cavil on words, and deserves no reply. Every medical man fully understands what Dr. Jenner has written, to guard practitioners from using matter which would not produce the specific disease; and, notwithstanding all the acumen which Dr. Pearson assumes upon this occasion, he will find it difficult to persuade them that Dr. Jenner's distinction was unnecessary. I conceive that Dr. Pearson attempts here a nice display of his logical and philological skill, rather than any thing else.

PAGES 112, 113, Dr. Pearson further says, that "it seems Dr. Jenner was unable to give a verbal description of the Cow-pock, as it appears from inoculation, owing to the paucity of instances (about seven cases only having then fallen under his observation) when he published his work in 1798." He then attempts to shew how much more accurate he has been in his observations, by an exemplification of his own *elegant*

*plate.* Whether Dr. Jenner was able to give a verbal description of the Cow-pock pustule, I leave the public to judge after what I have before observed. A person capable of so accurately defining it by various drawings, one would naturally suppose might be able to give some sort of description of it in language; and, if Dr. Jenner thought it so exactly like the Small-pox, why are his plates in such direct opposition to his description?

But to put the matter at a fair issue, I will trouble my medical readers to compare Dr. Pearson's plate with those of Dr. Jenner, and let them decide, which has given the best and most accurate delineation of the Vaccine pustule. Will Dr. Pearson have the goodness to inform the public why his drawing is made to represent the areola as more extensive on the eighth day than on the ninth; and, again, more florid on the eleventh than on the tenth? I am bold to affirm, that Dr. Pearson's drawings are by no means just representations of the Vaccine pustule in its different stages.

IN a note, page 114, an occasion is sought to reflect on Dr. Jenner, for having said that the inoculated Cow-pock so much resembled the Small-pox, that a surgeon declared he could not perceive the difference. A cursory reader would naturally imagine, from this representation, that Dr. Jenner had asserted this as a general principle, than which nothing can be further from the real fact. This *well selected* quotation of Dr. Pearson had only a reference to particular cases, and was meant to shew that such similarity sometimes occurred.

THE inoculated Cow-pock pustule is, confessedly, not always uniform in its appearance, and many instances have happened, at certain stages of it, when it would require a nicely discriminating eye to discover that characteristic difference, which Dr. Pearson so strenuously maintains, exists upon all occasions.

PAGE 116, Dr. Pearson again refers to the time of taking matter for the purpose of Vaccine inoculation, and he tells us that the directions of Dr. Jenner, not to exceed the eighth or ninth day, are

*hurtful cautions*, I trust I have said enough before to be sufficiently convincing, that Dr. Jenner's precautions were by no means *unnecessary*, and how they can be *hurtful* I leave to Dr. Pearson's ingenuity to make appear, and to his eloquence to describe. Dr. Pearson acknowledges if the matter be purulent it cannot be depended upon; why then does he clamour about inoculating at a late period, when, at any rate, it is more likely to become so? Abundance of facts concur to prove that Vaccine inoculation from matter taken in a very advanced state has not produced the specific disease, although it has occasioned a mock Vaccine pustule, local inflammation, and constitutional affection. Dr. Jenner is entitled to the best thanks of the public, for the nice distinctions he has pointed out between the spurious and the perfect Vaccine pustule—distinctions of the utmost importance to the safety of those inoculated.

NOTWITHSTANDING Dr. Pearson decries Dr. Jenner for his precautions in this respect, yet he himself assumes, that as a proof of his own great attention, "he was not unmindful, in his extensive correspondence, that matter should not be taken at

" too advanced a stage, or when some adventitious change had taken place." Observe Dr. Pearson's consistency in this particular instance.

PAGES 118, 119, and 120, Dr. Pearson devotes to the remarking upon the circumstances attending the first Vaccine inoculation in the Small-pox Hospital. There is still some degree of mystery in this business. It is an acknowledged fact that many patients had variolous-like eruptions, and from what cause these originated yet remains to be explained.

IN a pamphlet published at this time by Dr. Woodville, there were some positions which, if they had been true, would have annihilated Dr. Jenner's theory. Dr. Jenner asserted, that neither variolous-like pustules, nor contagion by effluvia, belonged to the Cow-pox. Dr. Woodville told us we were to expect both. Dr. Jenner replied, and in a mild, gentleman-like manner supported his first opinions. Dr. Woodville soon after published his recantation ; but, I am sorry to say, not in language the most gracious or good-humored.

Dr. Woodville was displeased with Dr. Jenner for the observations he had made upon these inoculations. Whose reasonings were most just, subsequent facts have pretty well determined. Certain it is, that they produced some severe animadversions upon Dr. Jenner's theory, that the Cow-pox was not an eruptive disease ; and Dr. Pearson, reasoning upon these and other eruptive cases, in the creation of which he was more immediately concerned \*, was strongly disposed to doubt the truth of a position which further experience has proved was perfectly correct.

PAGE 121, contrasts the assertions of two writers upon the effects produced by matter taken at a late period, which Dr. Pearson makes use of to introduce a long note, with a bit of morality prefixed.

THE statement of both these writers I am inclined to think may be perfectly consistent. M. tells us, that "he has inoculated with sufficient success with matter when the areola was fully formed ;" and the other correspondent says, that

\* At Petworth and many other places.

at a certain undetermined period, but always at a late one, the Cow-pock virus is capable (he does not say that it necessarily does, *but it is capable*) of producing morbid and phagedenic ulcers. The first gentlemen may have inoculated with sufficient effect at the period he states, but surely this does not prove that it may not be more prudent to take the virus a day or two earlier; and the latter may reason from matter taken in a state of purulency, which probably would produce the consequences he mentions. If Dr. Pearson had reflected a little upon this, his note and observations might have been spared. The Rev. George Jenner's experiments, published in the Medical and Physical Journal, decidedly prove the line of conduct every inoculator ought to pursue, as far as respects the state of the pustule.

PAGE 123, exhibits another cavil upon words, Dr. Jenner having said, that the Vaccine fluid is capable of undergoing a decomposition; Dr. Pearson objects to the *term*, and attempts to affix a degree of ridicule upon it; for the same reason he again drags forward the term *spurious pustule*. I

presume not upon a sufficiency of chemical knowledge to enable me to determine whether Dr. Pearson is right or not in this instance respecting the decomposition of matter. The expression certainly conveys an idea perfectly intelligible; but if it should not be strictly correct, Dr. Pearson might have dissented from it in a more handsome manner. Unfortunately, liberality is by no means the characteristic of the Doctor's publication,

PAGES 127, 128, 129, and 130, contain certain questions, which I shall reply to as briefly as I am able \*.

1st. "WHETHER the petitioners directions, concerning the time of selecting matter, are not contrary to facts? and, if so, whether by thus introducing error the progress of the history has not been impeded?"

IN reply to this I would observe, that I trust it has been abundantly proved, that Dr. Pearson has

\* IF I abridge Dr. Pearson's questions, I will endeavour not to injure the sense, I do it only to save time.

by no means made out his cases of error; and Dr. Denman, a man remarkable for the accuracy of his observations, has remarked, that every thing valuable in the history of the Vaccine disease has proceeded from Dr. Jenner.

2d. "WHETHER the term spurious Cow-pock has  
" not been productive of mistakes and false no-  
" tions?"

THIS is beyond my comprehension; medical men perfectly understand what Dr. Jenner means by the term spurious Cow-pock; and, if not every way correct, it sufficiently conveys the meaning that was intended: but, notwithstanding all Dr. Pearson's acumen, I do not yield this point. Does not Dr. Pearson know, that Cow-pock virus itself may produce upon the arm a pustule containing Vaccine matter and capable of conveying the Vaccine disease to others, and yet that the person on whom this was produced will not be found to have received that impression from it, which gives security to the constitution from the Small-pox? Is it not also sometimes exactly the same with the Small-

pox? To the latter I can speak positively in the affirmative from experience in my own family, and for the truth of the former we have the assertion of many practitioners. What then are the pustules so produced? certainly *spurious Vaccine and spurious variolous.*

3d. "WHETHER pointing out the sources of animal matter, which on inoculation would produce spurious Cow-pox, is not nugatory in case the discriminating character of Cow-pox had been described; and as undescribed, the account of these sources would not be adequate to prevent mistakes, into which practitioners would ever fall."

I HAVE only to repeat, that Dr. Jenner did not only point out the improper sources of animal matter, he described, by his very accurate plates, the characteristic appearance of the Cow-pox pustule\*, and in all his varied correspondence he

\* DR. Jenner's plates exhibit every essential stage of the Vaccine pustule, as well as that which was derived from the Horse, after having passed once through the human subject.

made use of every precaution to prevent the introduction of those errors, which the nature of a novel practice made the inexperienced inoculator liable to commit.

4th. "WHETHER some of the effects imputed to  
 "the sources of spurious Cow-pock are merely  
 "imaginary, or, at most, but varieties: such as  
 "when the Cow-pox pustule has degenerated into  
 "an ulcer (to which state it is often disposed to  
 "pass if not timely checked) I suspect the matter  
 "possessing very different qualities may sooner or  
 "later be produced, and although it may have  
 "passed that stage wherein the specific properties  
 "of the matter secreted are no longer in it, yet  
 "when applied to a sore (as in the casual way)  
 "it might dispose that sore to ulceration, and,  
 "from its irritation, the system would probably  
 "become affected, and thus by assuming some of  
 "its strongest characters it would imitate the ge-  
 "nuine Cow-pox." (Jenner's Further Observa-  
 tions, p. 7.) "On the rock of experience, first, I  
 "must contradict the assertion of the proneness of

" Cow-pock to degenerate into ulcer\*. Secondly,  
 " I say that nothing but Cow-pock matter ever  
 " produces any pock which by its resemblance can  
 " impose upon an experienced eye, and will be  
 " considered as the Cow-pock."

IN answer to the first part of this statement I will dare affirm that the experience of some of the most respectable practitioners of the Vaccine inoculation has proved, that the effects imputed to it by Dr. Jenner, are not so imaginary as Dr. Pearson would wish us to believe: but as to *varieties*, as Dr. Pearson has not thought proper to inform us what he means by that term, or to what he would confine it, I must confess myself unable to comprehend its application, and therefore shall not attempt to contend with such sophistry.

To place the matter in as favourable a point of view for himself as possible, he gives us a partial

\* DR. Jenner was here speaking of the disease when communicated to a casual pre-existing sore immediately from the Cow. Dr. Pearson well knew this, although he has thought proper to represent it otherwise.

quotation from Dr. Jenner's work, and such a one as no doubt he imagined would best answer his purpose. Dr. Pearson is very expert at this sort of practice, which is fully evinced by the many garbled letters he has published of Dr. Jenner's on former occasions.

DR. Pearson supposes his footing to be firm on the rock of experience; but, although he has chosen his position, I think I shall be able to prove that he does not stand very secure there. It is well known, that at the commencement of Vaccination, the arms were often so much inflamed as to create some degree of alarm, and it is a circumstance not altogether unworthy of notice, that it should have occurred more frequently at that time than it has at any subsequent period. We know that when milkers receive the infection from the Cows, their indisposition is generally more severe than that which takes place in the inoculation from one human subject to another. Large ulcers are often the consequence of such casual infection, and the virus may probably be rendered more mild after having passed several times through the human

constitution. This I think is the only satisfactory way in which we can account for the fact of sore arms being so prevalent in the first stages of Vaccine inoculation, and for their having almost entirely disappeared since.

I MUST be allowed to differ from Dr. Pearson's next direct assertion, "that nothing but Cow-pock matter ever produces a pock resembling "the Cow pock." Many inoculations have taken place, where a pustule has been produced which has so far imposed upon the inoculator, and his medical friends, that they have been doubtful whether it might not be pronounced genuine and efficient, but when for their more complete satisfaction the patient has again been inoculated, they have discovered their first opinions to have been erroneous.

5th. "WHETHER the not describing the Vaccine pock, the not noticing the day of the pocks re-presented by the plates, and the alledged precise resemblance of the Small-pock to the Cow-pock, were the occasion of the mistakes among

" the inoculators for the new disease, and of the  
" impediments in practice?" — — — — —

I TRUST I have before so completely refuted  
every thing contained in this insinuation, that I  
need not here make any remarks upon it.

6th. " WHETHER there is any evidence of the  
" petitioner having discovered any new method of  
" preserving Vaccine matter, or of any new mode  
" of inoculation?"

I DO not think it necessary to transcribe any more  
of this question, as the latter part contains only the  
assertion, that he (Dr. P.) discovered a new method  
of preserving and transmitting matter. I believe  
Dr. Jenner's mode of sending the virus between  
two pieces of glass was an invention of his own,  
and it is at present considered equally efficacious  
with any that has been adopted. The identical  
matter with which the first Vaccine experiment  
was made in London by Mr. Cline, at Dr.  
Jenner's desire, he told us had been kept in a vial  
upon the end of a quill for more than three

months. What Dr. Pearson means by a *new mode*\* of inoculation I cannot conceive; indeed this is a subject too trifling to dwell upon for a single moment.

7th. "WHETHER the representation of great inflammation in the inoculated part was subsequently found to exist as stated, and whether the applications recommended by Dr. Jenner did not impede the new practice?" Dr. Pearson tells us that Dr. Woodville found but one instance of the inoculated part ulcerating, and he adds, that his own observations confirm this doctrine.

To this question I shall only reply, that the experience of other practitioners has been different from that of Dr. Woodville and Dr. Pearson. I speak from knowledge when I assert, that inflammation does, even now, occasionally arise among the laborious poor, and that sometimes it is attended with ulceration; but in almost every in-

\* This, like many other things, appears the creation of Dr. Pearson's own brain.—It would be ridiculous in any man to set up a claim of superior merit in the mere operative part of the practice, when this matter is so well understood by every intelligent medical man in the kingdom.

stance which I have seen it has been quickly subdued by the simple means pointed out by Dr. Jenner.

It is difficult to follow Dr. Pearson through all his meanderings ; he is sometimes, from the natural result of his own arguments, obliged to allow Dr. Jenner some small degree of merit, but he always does it with a very ill grace, and takes care, at the same time, to attack him at all points upon which he founded his claim to remuneration.

IN page 133, Dr. Pearson reluctantly allows, “ that Dr. Jenner did make certain communications, for which the public are indebted, to him ; ” but he immediately adds, “ that the number of instances was small, and the testimonies far from being sufficient to command assent.” The only deduction you can draw from Dr. Pearson’s premises, are, that to himself alone the world is indebted for all the satisfaction it has received upon the Vaccine subject.

DR. Jenner’s publications are the best reply to such arrogant pretensions ; and, notwithstanding

the boast of Dr. Pearson's researches, there was certainly very little information in his first pamphlet but what he derived from Dr. Jenner himself.

In pages 135, 136, 137, 138, and 139, Dr. Pearson labours to affix a degree of censure upon Dr. Jenner, for having asserted that a person may have the Cow-pock after going through the Small-pox; and, again, that the same person may have the Cow-pock more than once.

DR. Jenner, in his first publication, has fully proved, that the casual Cow-pock may be taken by persons having had the Small-pox; and also that in the same way, they might again and again be infected with the Cow-pock, although commonly \* in a less violent degree than would take place in a person who had never been infected with either of the diseases †.

\* DR. Jenner says, *he has seen* the second disease the most violent.

† WHILE this publication was in the press, I was informed by Dr. Jenner that he had recently inoculated an infant from a pustule on the thumb of Mr. Cother, surgeon of Cheltenham, which went through all

IN page 135, Dr. Pearson modestly assures us, that Dr. Jenner was completely ignorant of the whole matter, not being at that time even acquainted with the diagnostic character of the Vaccine pock. It would be an insult to common sense to make any observation upon so strange an assertion, which could only have proceeded from the pen of Dr. Pearson.

IN pages 147 to 151, are detailed the opinions of several medical men, as well as of some of the members of the House of Commons, respecting the sacrifices which Dr. Jenner had made in prosecuting his enquiries, and in making the result of those enquiries public. The manner in which Dr. Pearson has made these communications, and his *liberal notes of admiration!!!* I shall leave every person to make his own reflections upon; but when, after all this, he says in the next page, “that his “own feelings, and his apprehensions of being “suspected of invidious motives, prevent his ex-

its stages in the most correct manner, and was in every respect as perfect a Vaccine pustule as ever he saw. The child which was inoculated from it had the disease in each arm correctly. Mr. Cother himself had the Small-pox in his infancy.

"amination of these statements;" gravity itself can scarcely forbear a smile.

DR. Pearson leaves his friends to judge, after perusing the history of Vaccine inoculation, whether the establishment of it depended upon Dr. Jenner's changing his mode of life, and the place of his residence.

THE confidence his presence inspired, and the satisfaction expressed by all ranks of people in London, are the best evidences of the propriety, as well as necessity, of his determination in this respect. It was, certainly in the first instance, much against his own inclination, but he felt that he owed somewhat to the opinion of his friends in the country, who thought he ought to attend to the urgent invitations he was daily receiving from some of the most eminent medical characters in town. They knew the Vaccine cause would be most essentially served by Dr. Jenner's residence in London, and, with this conviction pressing upon their minds, they prevailed upon him to yield to their intreaties. It was, no doubt, a mortifying

circumstance to Dr. Pearson, and evidently excited some of that spleenetic humor since manifested in his life and writings.

The generous, undisguised manner in which Dr. Jenner made his first Vaccine communications, sufficiently protects him from the suspicion of having ever entertained any idea of making a private, individual advantage of his discovery ; but Dr. Pearson's reasonings upon it furnish an additional proof of his determination to subtract every particle of merit from him. He denies that which almost every man in the kingdom besides himself fully admits ; and, notwithstanding all his ingenuity, I am confident he will not make many converts to his opinion, \*that considerable emolument would not have arisen to Dr. Jenner, if he had made an entire mystery of Cow-pock inoculation. I am sanctioned in this sentiment by the evidence of many of the first medical men as delivered before the Committee. It is only the spirit of opposition that makes Dr. Pearson himself deny the fact ; as nothing could have been more easily effected, had Dr. Jenner deviated, but in a small degree, from

that upright line of conduct which he has pursued so honorably to himself from the commencement of his pursuit.

NEVER was the integrity of any committee so directly impeached, nor ever was the common sense of all the Members of the House of Commons so reflected upon, as they have been by Dr. Pearson, in his unwarrantable attack upon their determination respecting the petition of Dr. Jenner. His chagrin transports him beyond all bounds of decorum, because the Committee did not acknowledge his merits to be equal, if not superior, to Dr. Jenner's; and his disappointment prompts him to make assertions that strict integrity should disdain.

DR. Pearson avers, that the Gentlemen who formed the Committee were friends to Dr. Jenner; (only one of whom, I presume, he means to except, as to him alone he offers up the incense of flattery.) Mr. Banks's wisdom, he says, was conspicuous in admonishing the House of Commons of the duties they owed to the public, and in explaining that the Report ought to be considered as a partial repre-

fentation. He does not give the House credit even for common understanding, for he asserts, that their arguments were mere echoes of the Report, which Report, in point of historical fact was incorrect; and that their further information could only be derived from statements which were considered as the exaggerated account of friends to the pecuniary interests of the petition. Here is justice and candor with a vengeance! But how will Dr. Pearson defend himself when I tell him, that Mr. Banks, whom he so much extols at the expence of his colleagues, was the very gentleman who drew up the Report, and who filled the Chair after Admiral Berkeley had quitted it through indisposition. This is a circumstance, I presume, that Dr. Pearson must have been entirely ignorant of, from his severe censure of it, and the compliments he pays Mr. Banks, whilst the opinions of the other members are treated with such contempt.

PAGES 159 TO 162, contain a recapitulation of what Dr. Pearson had before so fully dilated upon; and I do not feel myself called upon to go over the same ground with him again, as I have replied to,

and, I trust, have controverted almost every statement which they contain. Dr. Pearson appears to be greatly hurt because Dr. Jenner did not come forwards with an acknowledgment of services to him and Dr. Woodville ; but Dr. Jenner's friends thought the Vaccine inoculation had been better promoted by other practitioners, and he could not feel much delicacy towards a man who had arrogated so great a share of merit to himself, and who had, in all his publications, endeavoured to impress upon the mind of the public, that little merit of any kind attached to him.

BEFORE Drs. Woodville and Pearson fancy themselves the early promoters of Vaccine inoculation, let them coolly and dispassionately review their own conduct. Let them both reflect on their having sent out variolous instead of Vaccine matter, and the shocking consequences that followed. Let the former consider the absurdities of his first publication, and the check that it immediately gave, in all directions, to the new practice, by representing Cow-pox as giving variolous-like pustules in 300 cases out of 500, and by falsely reporting it also

to be contagious. Let the latter coolly consider (if he is capable of cool consideration) the effect of his reasoning upon the Petworth cases, &c. &c.

It may not, perhaps, be considered as entirely unworthy of remark, that Dr. Pearson should have been the only medical man examined whose evidence went to deprive Dr. Jenner of the credit of his discovery. I wish I could ascribe his conduct to those honourable motives which he repeats so often he was alone actuated by. As long as Dr. Jenner favored Dr. Pearson with his personal communications and correspondence, all the invidious workings of his mind were stifled; but as soon as his character was unfolded to Dr. Jenner; when some circumstances occurred which made it a point of common prudence to break off their intimacy, then the real disposition of Dr. Pearson was displayed in the most glaring colors. In his correspondence, both in this and foreign countries, he scarcely mentions the name of Dr. Jenner; in these communications, his own merits are alone conspicuous; and, had all our knowledge been confined to this correspondence, we should have supposed

that to Dr. Pearson alone was the world indebted for the blessings of the Vaccine discovery.

FORTUNATELY for Dr. Jenner, the most respectable medical men in the kingdom were in possession of all the facts, and Dr. Pearson's conduct was reprobated in the manner it deserved \*. His conduct before the Committee I have before noticed; and his examination of the Report will be a standing memorial to what artful shifts a man can have recourse, to support opinions which are in no respect founded upon facts; for, in spite of all Dr. Pearson's envious attacks upon Dr. Jenner's reputation, the world is satisfied that to him, and to him only, it is indebted for a discovery the most important that was ever made in physiology; and his name will descend to posterity with all the honors it so justly merits, while a very few years will involve that of Dr. Pearson in its native original obscurity—an obscurity from which it pro-

\* Why did the name of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, which so glaringly appeared upon the walls of the house appropriated for Dr. Pearson's inoculation, so suddenly disappear? Why, also, did not Lord Egremont accept the Vice Presidency of this Vaccine institution? This is a long story. The Dr. will certainly never tell it himself, nor shall I tell it for him. It is well understood by the public.

bably would never have far emerged, had he not availed himself of the lucky incident which Dr. Jenner's genius threw in his way.

DR. Pearson has not only impeached the integrity of the Committee, but he has severely censured the grounds on which the House of Commons voted Dr. Jenner his remuneration; he charges the Members with partiality, and asserts that they did not see the question in its proper point of view: that the Committee was not competent to examine into the merits of the petition, and that a tribunal of medical men only could, with propriety, have decided upon it. I really want my own understanding enlightened to enable me to discover any thing in this petition which a man of plain common sense might not easily comprehend; it is neither encumbered with technical terms, nor is the matter of it involved in any mystery: and I will venture to say there is not a sentence in it but must have been perfectly intelligible to every member of the Committee, without any great stretch of his mental faculties. Many of the first medical characters in London were brought for-

wards upon this examination, and many more of equal respectability were ready to have given similar testimonies, if the Committee had not been satisfied.

Dr. Pearson says, there was no contravening evidence besides his own, and what he brought forwards; but, I presume, he does not mean to insinuate, that any unfair means were used to suppress such, for I will be bold to assert, there never was any question more severely scrutinized, or where more time was given to ascertain the justice of the grounds upon which the merits of the petition rested. What Dr. Pearson calls contravening evidence appears in so suspicious a guise, that it only serves to expose the designs of the authors of it, and not to invalidate, nor even in the least degree to weaken the force of Dr. Jenner's claim.

ADMIRAL Berkeley, who filled the Chair in the Committee till he was obliged to resign it through indisposition, spoke afterwards on the Report in the House of Commons to the following effect: "That in the investigation of a matter so impor-

" tant to mankind in general, it was not thought  
" right by the Committee to confine their ex-  
" amination to the petitioner's evidence alone, as  
" is usually the case, but to sift out any matter  
" that could make against it. This conduct, which  
" certainly may appear rather to bear hard upon  
" the petitioner, has proved a matter of fresh  
" triumph to him; for, although we descended  
" to sift out information from every anonymous  
" letter—though we raked the very kennels for  
" information against this practice, all that we  
" were enabled to get is pointed out at full length  
" in the Report; and, such were the explana-  
" tions in those very cases—such were the testi-  
" monies against that evidence, that if Dr. Jen-  
" ner's discovery could receive additional lustre  
" from this sort of enquiry, it certainly has  
" done so."

It must certainly have been highly gratifying to Dr. Jenner to hear such sentiments expressed, and the debate which took place in the house, must have been flattering, indeed, to his feelings. How these things operated on Dr. Pearson's mind, his own book will best explain.

I COULD extend my remarks much beyond what I have done, but I should only tire the patience of my readers; I could have pointed out numerous other instances where Dr. Pearson has misrepresented facts; and I could have more fully exposed his invidious disposition. I have, however, thought it better to confine myself to some of those glaring mis-statements which affect the most material part of the question; and, in doing so, I could not avoid contrasting Dr. Pearson's former and present opinions which rest upon matter of fact, that the public may determine what degree of credit is due to a man who so far forgets, or rather suppresses, what he has himself before written and published upon the same subject, that there is scarcely a circumstance unconnected with his libellous attack upon the integrity of the Committee, but stands in almost direct opposition to his own former admissions and assertions.

I HAVE, as far as possible, avoided declamatory censure and personal abuse; I have endeavoured to meet the Doctor on his own ground, and have confined myself to the discussion of a few material points---points which he himself has brought up-

der review; and which he proudly maintains rest only on the basis of truth.

I LEAVE unnoticed the pedantry of his learned quotations, and poetical allusions: the drift of them requires no explanation: but I cannot avoid making some remarks on the manner in which Dr. Pearson has attempted to arrest the attention of his readers, by subjoining an index to render more conspicuous those particular parts where he imagines he has best elucidated his own merits, and detracted from those of Dr. Jenner. This artifice is wholly unworthy of a man who writes upon a scientific subject, who makes a profession of so much candor, and who affirms, he is actuated by no other motive than his love of truth and justice.

BUT let genuine candor decide, whether truth and justice can be that man's motive, who seeks to degrade the character of another, whose claim to public regard has been so universally sanctioned. It was reserved for Dr. Pearson, alone, to be the open antagonist of Dr. Jenner.

WHEN we reflect upon the number of medical characters of the highest eminence and respectability, who have rendered Dr. Jenner the most unqualified tribute of applause for the merit of his discovery---when we observe them unite in expressions of the warmest esteem for his distinguished genius, and for his singular philanthropy---when we reflect that the legislature has sanctioned this public opinion---when we remark that this opinion is that of the whole world, we must pity the man whose fond self-love inclines him to suppose he was actuated by truth and justice in his attack upon such a character.

---

---

## APPENDIX.

---

SINCE sending the foregoing sheets to the prefs,  
I have read the remarks made upon Dr. Pearson's publication by the Critical Reviewers, in their Journal for October last; and as the article bears strong internal evidence of being written by one of Dr. Pearson's partial friends, I shall take leave to make a few observations upon it. To call it a review of Dr. Pearson's book seems almost ridiculous, it is rather a feeble attempt to shew that the public reward has been misplaced, and that the greater portion of merit for all that has been done to establish the Vaccine inoculation, is due to Drs. Woodville and Pearson.

THE reviewer, as though he felt somewhat conscious of betraying a spirit of party hostile to Dr. Jenner, endeavours to anticipate the charge by observations which are designed to impress us with a belief that he wishes only to elicit truth.

WHEN he tells us that it does not become him to say that the legislature has decided improperly, but that a more minute discrimination would have avoided a few of the objections which malice or prejudice may raise, we are not at a loss to divine his opinion; but there is certainly a great degree of arrogance in any man's calling in question the decision of Parliament founded on the Report of one of its Committees, before which every evidence was invited and adduced that could possibly elucidate the subject, and which was above all designed to prove, whether Dr. Jenner had or had not a well founded claim to remuneration. The petitioner certainly did not claim his reward as represented by the reviewer, for having discovered that a disease called the Cow-pox may be communicated to the human frame, thereby securing it from the attack of Small-pox. I have stated page 12, of my

book, what was the particular discovery of Dr. Jenner; and I will not do the reviewer so much injustice as to suppose him ignorant of the real merits of it—This is too much in the spirit of Dr. Pearson's partial quotations. The claim would, indeed, have been fallacious if it had rested on such a foundation. It was *the happy application of the fact*, and his making public all the phænomena belonging to Cow-pox, which entitle Dr. Jenner to the eternal gratitude of mankind; and what confusion would have taken place (confusion, perhaps, which would have long suspended the blessings we enjoy from the discovery) had he not so clearly pointed out the difference between the pustule which produces the preventive effect, and that which does not.

ALMOST all the discoveries that were ever made in any branch of science appear simple and obvious, and we are surprised how they could have lain so long concealed from the observation of mankind. Dr. Wm. Hunter, when speaking of the discovery of the circulation of the blood, observed, that it was a curious circumstance, when

the anatomy of the most minute parts of the human body was so well known, that this should have lain hid, “till the keen glance of Hervey hit upon ‘it.’” Now Dr. Pearson, many years ago, mentioned in his lectures (as I have before noticed), that Mr. John Hunter had communicated to him the information he had received upon the subject of Cow-pox from Dr. Jenner; and it appears rather curious that neither the *keen glance of Dr. Pearson*, nor of any other medical gentlemen, who have opposed Dr. Jenner’s claim to originality, should have penetrated the mystery which has since been so completely developed by him.

The reviewer pursues a train of reasoning which I must be allowed to term unfair and invidious. It was not “because he thought he should be less ‘respected in Gloucestershire,’” that Dr. Jenner went to London, but that some of the London practitioners were daily committing blunders, and that many of the first medical characters, who knew with what candor and liberality he was always accustomed to make his communications, thought his presence absolutely necessary to the establishment of the practice. The liberal remark,

" that the few cases recorded by Dr. Jenner might have been observed while running," is only a paraphrase of Dr. Pearson's statement; it is one of his sentiments in a new dress: but I have satisfactorily proved that these cases were not so limited as Dr. Pearson has falsely represented, and, certainly, whether Dr. Jenner is to be considered as "a public benefactor, or a discoverer of the first magnitude," will not rest on the opinions either of Dr. Pearson or the Critical Reviewer.

How far the value of his exertions have been increased by the improvement of his successors we are not informed. We are told by the reviewer that it is so, but the *quo modo* is left unexplained, as are also the circumstances which he says he has stated to prove that the practice would have sunk into oblivion, if it had not rested on the secure basis of more extensive and clearer observation \*.

\* LET us refer to a learned and sagacious writer on this subject, who, after a careful review of it, seals his opinion with his name: "It appears to me that none of the facts or observations mentioned by Dr. Jenner have been disproved or refuted; and that no information has been gained on any material point by all that has been written upon the subject since the publication of his first treatise." DENMAN.

What follows is still more extraordinary and more unfounded, "Dr. Jenner having started the subject and pursued it somewhat carelessly, left it and his residence seemingly spleenetic and angry, having dropped the foundling, he seemed displeased that any one should have cherished and supported it." I am satisfied that the reviewer has too great a regard for his own character to make so serious a charge against any man without supposing he had sufficient grounds to justify himself in doing so. I hope, then, he will pardon me if I tell him that he has been grossly deceived in the whole of this representation. In the first place, I assert from my *own knowledge*, that the subject was never pursued carelessly; it was the object of Dr. Jenner's unremitting attention, excited all his industry, and was pursued by him with unceasing care and anxiety. I myself was again and again called upon to witness the progress of the *discovery* \*; and from that day

\* THE reviewer will excuse my using this term against his decided assertion; but if he would read with an unprejudiced mind the series of Dr. Jenner's publications on this interesting subject, I will venture to say he would, in future, view the origin and progress of Vaccination in a very different light to that in which at present it seems to appear to him; he

to the present moment his whole time has been so much engaged by it, that every other consideration in life has sunk before it. The *foundling*, as the reviewer is pleased to call it, was never dropped or deserted, it has always been the child of Dr. Jenner's fondest hopes, and so far from being spleenetic and angry when it was noticed by the world, he was never so highly gratified as when he found it patronized by men of talent and genius.

THE review comprises so many of Dr. Pearson's particular doctrines and opinions, that I cannot help being confirmed in what I have before remarked, respecting the source from whence it either directly or indirectly proceeded.

THAT the Cow-pox will sometimes affect those who have had the Small-pox, I can positively assert;

has, probably, formed his opinion of the conduct of Dr. Jenner from the writings of Drs. Woodville and Pearson, both of whom have designedly held it up in a distorted point of view, and both have totally omitted a whole series of inoculations published in Dr. Jenner's second treatise. These inoculations commenced in November or December, 1798, and by this omission much important information upon various points is by them withheld.

for since my first observations were made upon Dr. Pearson's book, I have known a person inoculated for the Cow-pox, who received the infection both locally and constitutionally, although she had before, in a most unequivocal way, had the Small-pox. I particularly mention this fact as a caution to the reviewer, not too hastily to adopt the assertions and opinions of others upon a subject which may be so easily submitted to the test of experiment \*.

THE reviewers two next declarations are equally unwarrantable, and I can only lay them to the same account of rashness with many others which mark this extraordinary attack. He says the suggestions of phagedenic ulcers following inoculation, and of a spurious Cow-pock †, are equally unfounded; we cannot be at a loss to conjecture the authority we are to be referred to for these assertions; but as to the latter, even his favorite

\* THIS has been fully explained in a letter written some years since by Dr. Jenner to Dr. Pearson, as appears by Dr. Pearson's publications.

† I defy either the reviewer, or Dr. Pearson, to shew me that Dr. Jenner has ever said, that such was not distinguishable from the true kind.

Dr. Pearson, although he objects to the term *spurious*, yet he has, under certain fancied limitations, admitted the fact. As to the former, I have myself been a witness to many instances of very bad fore arms in the early part of the Vaccine practice; and the Rev. Mr. Colborne of Stroud, in this county, who had two of his children inoculated, was so much alarmed at the state of one of their arms, that further medical assistance was called in, and he declared to me, that he would never have another child inoculated with Cow-pock matter. This happened at a very early period, and long before either Drs. Woodville or Pearson had interested themselves concerning it \*---I lament the delicate state of the reviewer's nerves, which occasions his feeling so much disgust at the idea of the Vaccina being derived from the horse's heels, but when he goes so far as to assert, that whether it is so or not, it can have no connection with the subject, I can only express my astonishment that any person, supposed to deliver the sentiments of so learned a

\* Dr. Jenner at this time certainly adopted some powerful specific applications, as the surest means of checking violent inflammation—He very soon after discovered that Goulard's Extract of Saturn answered every purpose, and this fact he immediately published.

society, should have made such a declaration upon so curious a physiological question.

THE experiments which have been instituted to ascertain the fact of the Vaccine disease deriving its origin from this source, have very satisfactorily proved the truth of the theory \*; and Dr. Loy, of Aislaby, in Yorkshire, in his late treatise, has removed most of the doubts which before existed †; but the great partiality manifested by the reviewer for Drs. Woodville and Pearson, loudly calls upon the friends of Dr. Jenner to maintain for him that pre-eminence which they know he is so justly entitled to.

If the opinions and observations of the reviewers had appeared in any other publication, I should

\* By the more early admission of this fact, distant nations might have been long since in possession of the prophylactic, although they have hitherto been disappointed in the receipt of matter from this country, in a proper state for communicating the genuine disease.

† I AM only surprised that Dr. Loy's publication has not been more noticed in any of the late treatises upon Vaccination; the simple narrative of facts arising from his experiments is certainly very interesting, and if the reviewer had seen the book, I am sure he would have spared his observations upon this particular point.

have considered them as totally unworthy of remark, but when I reflected on the weight and consequence which generally attach to every thing proceeding from such a source, in justice to my friend, Dr. Jenner, I could not let them pass unnoticed.

THE value of such publications no man prizes higher than myself; and their increased circulation proves how much they are estimated by all the country.

THEY certainly diffuse a vast deal of knowledge —they are the arbiters of public taste, and I sincerely lament to see an article made subservient to party and prejudice.

F I N I S.

and the other side of the road  
was covered with tall grass and weeds.  
The road was very narrow and  
dangerous. We had to stop frequently  
to let horses pass. The road was  
very rough and rocky. We had to  
stop frequently to let horses pass.  
The road was very rough and rocky.







